

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/750,252	12/31/2003	Chang Hun Han	20063/OG03-047	8844
34431	7590 10/13/2005		EXAMINER	
HANLEY, FLIGHT & ZIMMERMAN, LLC			BOOTH, RICHARD A	
20 N. WACKER DRIVE SUITE 4220			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
CHICAGO, I	CHICAGO, IL 60606			
			DATE MAILED: 10/13/200	15

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/750,252	HAN, CHANG HUN				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Richard A. Booth	2812				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app						
Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timil apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 8/1/05	5.					
	action is non-final.					
·=	, 					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	·					
Disposition of Claims						
	dication					
 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-4 and 7-11 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
5)						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
o) Olaim(3) are subject to restriction and/or	ciconon requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex-	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		·				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents		on No				
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior						
application from the International Bureau	•	ou in the National Stage				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
dee the attached detailed office action for a fist of the definited copies not received.						
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 1) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date						
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)						
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:					
C. Datast and Trademod. Office		·				

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4 and 7-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scott, U.S. Patent 6,627,524 in view of Pradeep et al., U.S. Patent 5,866,448 or Zhou et al., U.S. Patent 5,858,847.

Scott shows the invention substantially as claimed including a method for fabricating a nonvolatile memory device comprising: forming an isolation layer and a non-active region in a semiconductor substrate 12; forming an oxide layer 14 and a polysilicon layer 15 on the substrate; forming a sacrificial layer 16 on the polysilicon layer; forming polymer layers 24 on sidewalls of the sacrificial layer; and forming a floating gate and a tunnel oxide using the sacrificial layer and polymer layers as an etching mask (see figs. 1-5 and col. 2-line 56 to col. 4-line 67).

Scott is applied as above but fails to expressly disclose the polymer layers being formed by patterning the sacrificial layer, the polymer layers being generated from the etching of the sacrificial layer.

Pradeep et al. discloses patterning a sacrificial layer (40,42) comprising an oxide and photoresist in order to form a polymer layer 44 on the sidewalls used to form a gate electrode (see figs. 3-4 and col. 4-lines 18-48). Alternatively, Zhou et al. discloses

patterning a sacrificial layer (23,24) comprising TEOS oxide in order to form a polymer layer 26 on the sidewalls used to form a gate electrode (see figs. 1-4 and col. 3-line 66 to col. 5-line 53). In view of these disclosures, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the process of Scott so as to form the polymer layers by etching the sacrificial layer because this would reduce the overall number of process steps, thereby decreasing process time.

With respect to the first and second sacrificial layers, note that what is meant by a "layer" is arbitrary and one layer can be considered to be an infinite number of smaller layers.

Concerning the particular spacing between adjacent polymer layers, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to determine through routine experimentation the desired spacing based upon various considerations such as the desired degree of integration and such limitation would not lend patentability to the instant application absent a showing of unexpected results.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 8/1/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary

skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the motivation to combine the references is clearly stated in the above rejections.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Richard A. Booth whose telephone number is (571) 272-1668. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 7:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Lebentritt can be reached on (571) 272-1873. The fax phone

Application/Control Number: 10/750,252 Page 5

Art Unit: 2812

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Richard A. Booth Primary Examiner

Art Unit 2812

October 11, 2005